Appl. No. 10/743,939 Amdt. dated January 5, 2005 Reply to Office action of October 5, 2004

## REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the Office action dated October 5, 2004 and the cited references. By way of this Response, claim 1 has been amended and claim 2 cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Turning to the art rejections, the Office action rejected claims 1-4 as anticipated by Oh (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,904). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Each of claims 1, 3 and 4 recites a repair fuse box of a semiconductor device where a plurality of fuse boxes each include a plurality of fuses. A unit fuse set is constructed from fuses selected from the fuses arranged in one or more of the plurality of fuse boxes.

Outermost fuses of the selected fuses are connected to signal connecting fuses. The signal connecting fuses are not cut or disconnected under repair or when repaired.

The applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Oh, because Oh does not teach each and every element of independent claim 1. In particular, Oh does not teach or suggest a signal connecting fuse which is not cut or disconnected under repair as recited claim 1. Although Oh discloses an address determining portion 210 having a plurality of fuses (FA1, ... FAi and FB1, ... FBi) and a master fuse 250 (Col. 2, Il. 10-59), Oh does not disclose that the master fuse is not cut under repair. To contrary, Oh specifically teaches that the master fuse 250 is disconnected or cut during test and repair operations. (Col. 2, Il. 29-33). As such, the master fuse 250 of Oh is not a signal connecting fuse which is not cut under repair, as recited in claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/743,939 Amdt. dated January 5, 2005 Reply to Office action of October 5, 2004

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claims 3 and 4 depending therefrom, are novel and non-obvious in view of Oh and should be allowed. In light of the foregoing, the prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the examiner have any questions, the examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. Wacker Drive 6300 Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6360

By:

Aaron M. Peters

Registration No.: 48,801 Attorney for Applicant

January 5, 2005